

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 056

SO 007 684

AUTHOR Lutzker, Michael A.
 TITLE The First Year of War & Peace Studies at Richmond College. A Report to the College.
 INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, Staten Island, N.Y. Richmond Coll.
 PUB DATE [73]
 NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
 DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum; Course Objectives; Diaries; *Experimental Programs; Formative Evaluation; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *International Education; *Peace; Program Descriptions; Student Attitudes; Teacher Role; Teaching Techniques; *War

ABSTRACT

A report of the first year of war and peace studies at an undergraduate institution is based on data from student evaluations, material from student journals, discussion with participating faculty, and observations of the program coordinator. The rationale of the experiment--to implement a program relevant to students, to encourage a dialogue across disciplinary lines among faculty, and to encourage student participation in the classroom--is discussed, and the two core courses which inaugurated the program are described. Results show that the college is successful in providing a multidisciplinary perspective, less successful in imparting a basic body of knowledge, and that it is too early to know if students have been sufficiently interested to pursue indepth studies in the program's related courses. The perspective, structure and content, related courses, and classroom strategies are described along with the important function of student journals and the role of the faculty. The first year is characterized as a modest success, and several recommendations are made for ensuing years. Basic data about the program and its participants, course syllabi, instructions on keeping a journal, and some excerpts from student journals are appended. (Author/KSM)

ie First Year of War & Peace Studies at Richmond College

A Report to the College*

As the War & Peace Program begins its second year, this is a good time to bring the Richmond community up to date on what we attempted the first year, what was achieved, and some of the lessons we are trying to draw from what went wrong.

The program is conceived of as an experiment, but that word has had such diverse meanings among our colleagues that some clarification is in order. By most Richmond standards (if one may use so bold a term) ours is a modest experiment. It represents not an assault on the traditions of higher education, but rather a collective effort to have it live up to its promise.

We sought to implement a program that was relevant to students, and would also enable Richmond faculty whose major concerns were in war and peace related areas, to combine their teaching and research interests. Moreover we wanted to encourage dialogue across disciplinary lines among faculty, and carry this dialogue into the classroom in such a way as to encourage student participation. Finally, we wished to promote the idea of systematic, rigorous inquiry on a collective basis. Considering the challenging problems we sought to explore, and the commitment the faculty had made to the program, we were prepared to ask a substantial effort on the part of students.

The program was inaugurated in 1972-73 with the introduction of two cooperatively taught, interdisciplinary (core) courses. Some lively discussion by participant faculty preceeded planning the specific content of

*Sources for this report include data from student evaluations (anon.), material from student journals, discussion with participating faculty as well as the coordinator's own observation.

ED 095056

50 007 684

these courses. Each faculty member had in mind initially a course that bore a striking resemblance to the approach utilized in his own discipline. The ensuing debates were useful: besides affording us a chance to exchange views, they were an early test of our ability to work together as a group. Moreover, we were made aware of the complexities involved in constructing a truly interdisciplinary course. Aided as much by their numbers as by the wisdom of their arguments, the historians persuaded their colleagues. It was also agreed that the whole question of emphasis would be subject to periodic review (In retrospect it is probably true that the first semester particularly, overemphasized history. Enriched by a broader perspective after listening to his colleagues during the past year, the coordinator has hopefully struck a better balance for the second.)

Despite our differences we did introduce students to the approaches of several disciplines. A total of 16 faculty members participated in teaching the two introductory courses, including at least one member from each of the Divisions. During the first semester we enlisted colleagues in literature, politics, and economics, in addition to history. This was later broadened to include psychology, religion, education, anthropology, and the physical sciences. It would be foolish to imagine that the students became knowledgeable in all these fields, however they were made aware of the contribution each has to offer in the way of understanding the nature of war, and the obstacles to peace.

The introductory (core) courses were conceived of as having three objectives:

- a. To provide a multidisciplinary perspective
- b. To impart a basic body of knowledge
- c. To interest students sufficiently so that they would pursue in depth studies in the program's related courses, bringing to them some substantive background.

To summarize the results briefly: we were quite successful in fulfilling the first; less so regarding the second; and it is too early to tell about the third.

a. The Multidisciplinary Perspective

We did introduce a variety of approaches and perspectives. At the risk of confusing the students, we gave them a sense of the complexity of the problems we were considering. In approaching war as a phenomenon that man has had to deal with for many centuries, under a variety of social systems, we tended to discourage the notion that it was a problem peculiar to our own time, caused by a particular set of "evil" forces whether these be capitalism, communism, imperialism etc. Similarly, in offering a framework for discussing world peace, we sought to present more than a single model by contrasting, for example, the Henry Kissinger road to peace with that of Dan Berrigan. When we turned to considering the obstacles to peace in the 20th century, the students heard a social psychologist discuss the implications of social conditioning to obedience, an economist spell out the economic impact of drastic cuts in military spending, an authority on teacher-education detail the emphasis on the martial spirit in grade school curricula, to name just a few. While the dimensions of the effort necessary to achieve a peaceful world remained unmistakably clear, we offered convincing evidence that every field in inquiry had something to contribute to that effort.

b. Structure and Content

We wanted to avoid a series of guest lectures that lacked the close interrelationship a course must have. Accordingly, each instructor was asked to attend the session preceeding his own so that he might better relate his material to the overall themes in the course. The majority of the faculty

cooperated in this regard. Despite this the students had difficulty integrating the different material.

In our brief historical survey of warfare we tried to show the evolution from the more restricted character of medieval and 18th century warfare (involving specific warrior classes) to the modern mass armies where the distinction between soldier and civilian tends to break down. World War I became the focal point of our efforts to show the roots of the present age of upheaval. The destabilizing effects of the 1914-1918 conflict on the world economy, the weakening of the powerful 19th century colonial systems, and the stirrings that followed, all provided a basis for consideration of revolution and counterrevolution in our own times.

One result was considerable unhappiness on the part of students majoring in fields other than history. Some were unconvinced of the relevance of historical materials to the problems of the present. Only a minority of the student journals demonstrated an understanding of the historical materials and an ability to compare data from different epochs. Even when journals showed a grasp of a particular reading selection, it was seldom meaningfully related to data in other readings. Reacting to this problem, there was a tendency on the part of the coordinator to oversimplify what were truly complex developments in order to highlight particular patterns we were seeking. Avoiding this tendency to oversimplify remains a major problem.

Despite the difficulties with this segment of the course, we have not abandoned it. However we have tried this year to meet the criticisms in a variety of ways: first by narrowing the scope of the historical survey; next by devoting less time to World War I and more to the present.

At the very beginning of the course we will use two films to dramatize the contrast between a limited kind of conflict and World War II. Moreover, drawing upon a suggestion of the students, we have allotted time for review sessions, which should be useful for tying together the material from different epochs.

Our efforts to have the students come away with a body of basic knowledge (mainly historical, but including other disciplines as well) cannot be counted a striking success. Probably we tried to cover too much. The desire to encourage class discussion rather than lecture, while certainly defensible, meant less time devoted to pointing out essentials from the readings and reiterating them in class. Judging by the student journals, a well organized lecture on a clearly defined topic came through best. (An example: How the economic problems of the less developed countries contribute to political instability.)

Additional student criticism was directed toward our rather arbitrary effort to limit the first semester to studying war while devoting the second to peace (the assumption being that student would take both segments). Graduating seniors, and others as well, wanted to deal with both in the same semester. Their view was reasonable. This year we have included with our study of war the subjects of wartime peace movements, draft resistance, conscientious objection, and amnesty.

c. The Related Courses

Time will tell whether students will be attracted to the related courses. Certainly the core courses tend to bring students in contact with professors and study areas that they might not otherwise consider. Favorable mention in student journals of particular presentations suggests student interest, often in fields outside their major. Two things would encourage students to take the related courses and thereby move beyond the tendency to specialize narrowly.

First, a concerted effort by faculty to draw upon themes from the core courses in teaching their courses -- along with publicizing that information. Second, a willingness on the part of each discipline to utilize a broad interpretation in computing related-course requirements for their majors, for example, including "The Literature of War" course as acceptable for majors in history or politics.

The Classroom

This was probably the most difficult and frustrating part of both courses. Guest speakers are at a disadvantage in promoting discussion, particularly when they know few (or none) of the students in the class. A lecture means less discussion, but how else can one explain some of the more difficult concepts in his discipline? Most colleagues chose to lecture, although a number tried to combine it with guided discussion. Several used supplementary materials: sheets with brief quotations; chronologies of wars; summaries of peace plans, etc., in addition to the readings. These aids were useful in providing a focus for discussion.

On the whole, however, the relatively small degree of student participation was disappointing. Here were topics that seemed to meet every qualification for "relevance" yet few students raised questions, made comments, or suggested points of controversy. This was true of both semesters. The films generally produced more discussion than the readings. This might lead to the cynical suggestion that little reading was being done. Yet some journals gave clear evidence of reading by students who had little or nothing to say in class. Our assumption was that two, three, or four faculty members present in class at times, questioning each other, would stimulate questions and discussion on the part of students. This had been the pattern in our workshops conducted during the Kent State-Cambodia crisis of 1970. It was less successful in 1972-73. Faculty dialogue certainly

seemed to hold the attention of the students. In conversations afterwards the students described such dialogue as interesting, sometimes a bit confusing, but generally as valuable (There is, of course, an element of the theatrical here that cannot be ignored.)

Sometimes the co-ordinator would pose questions to the class that would seek to link what a guest speaker had just said to the content of earlier topics. This was sometimes successful, but not often enough.

Toward the end of each semester there was more give and take, even some animated discussion, over topics such as poverty producing upheaval in the Third World, or the atomic bombing of Japan. This was probably a result of the students knowing each other better as well as the nature of the topic.

One student commented in the evaluation: "I felt the class was not very excited about participating. I don't know where that comes from but I believe it lies on both the students and you. Somehow the atmosphere was geared toward lecture instead of discussion. Part was apathy by students. Another was that some of the questions were so obvious, almost rhetorical..." This is not a typical comment and many more positive ones could be cited, but that is not the point. One problem remains the psychology of the students. They do not generally see their own role in making the course a genuine dialogue. Instructors may try many different strategies to initiate and guide discussion, but in the final analysis it is the students who will determine whether a discussion will be of value.

More typically the evaluations stressed what the student had learned from the course. Said one: "To connect politics, economics, institutions of control (educational system, military, family, religion, etc.) all together, and to clearly see their vast interconnections, was worth taking the course by itself."

Another commented, "I have come away from the course with a greater understanding of the world and its people. Why things are the way they are. The blinders have been lifted from my eyes. I have started questioning things I have never questioned before. I have started to think in a broader way."

Student Journals

The only written work required of students was that they keep a journal throughout the course. (see appendix: "On Keeping a Journal") In it they were asked to discuss the readings, the films, lectures, and discussion. But the essence of the journal was to be a record of their own viewpoints, thoughts, and experiences as they related to the course.

The journals are a good reflection of both the strengths and weaknesses of the core courses. As everyone knows, this student generation is scarcely one composed of diary-keepers, or people who systematically put pen to paper. Initial student reaction was uncertainty as to what was called for, tinged with some skepticism. Confusion was compounded at the outset by a lack of written guidelines or sample entries. It is likely that the early drop-outs (particularly during the first semester) correlated with the demands of journal writing.

When collected about mid-semester, a number proved clearly unsatisfactory, showing little grasp of the readings, less insight into the questions raised. (Collecting the journals so far along in the semester was an error corrected the following semester.) Following individual conferences, several of the journals were re-written or alternative assignments were offered. By the semester's end all had a clearer idea of what the journal form entailed. A few of the best entries were duplicated and circulated. The journals improved considerably.

Despite the difficulties of the journal assignment there were substantial offsetting advantages. The journals represent a permanent written record of the courses and their impact upon the students. Through them we became aware of a student's grasp of the materials. We knew which topics had aroused particular interest. They provide a valuable guide to the student's concern with the subject, as well as his/her level of sophistication in dealing with difficult questions. We encouraged a personal dimension in the journal. Fortunately, a number of them give us a clear insight into how the courses affected their overall view. In the student evaluations, most of those who discussed the journal had a positive view of it. (See excerpts in appendix)

Role of the Faculty

This represented the most successful element so far. Faculty members approached for their assistance were exceptionally cooperative. The coordinator received many valuable suggestions, was aided in choosing topics, readings, and establishing what was expected of students. When colleagues were asked to condense their presentations into fewer sessions to allow room for others, this was done with good humor. When proposed readings did not seem to the coordinator to fit the overall framework of the course, faculty members came up with others. Many colleagues attended lengthy planning and evaluation meetings. Several made brief introductory presentations the first week of class, often attended sessions preceeding their own (to maintain continuity in the course), and some attended additional sessions to serve as panelists or participate in discussions. All this was volunteered over and above regular teaching and other commitments. This extraordinary effort produced the kind of faculty dialogue that comes through in the best of team-teaching situations -- only here it was on a far broader scale. (One is tempted to use the phrase

'community of scholars'). In their evaluations the students spoke in very positive terms about the cooperative faculty effort.

Participating faculty included:

From Social Science I:	Fetzer, Fedyshyn, P. Fischer, Hirschfeld, Greenberg, Roberts, Stearns, & Warnecke
Social Science II:	Swiderski
Social Science III:	Bernstein
Humanities	Ebel, Chiles
Professional Studies	Kavett
Science & Engineering	Bernow

Faculty Seminar

Originally we projected four meetings during the Spring '73 semester:

One on the theories of Clausewitz, to be led by S. Stearns; another on Henry Kissinger, to be led by J. Fetzer; a third on Robert Heilbroner and the Third World economies, to be led by P. Fischer; and a fourth on Shakespeare's Henry V, to be led by H. Ebel. Unfortunately, due to the scheduling of additional meetings of faculty, Division, etc. we were able to hold only the session on Henry V. It is hoped that the remaining ones may be held during the Fall '73 semester.

Overall Evaluation

Our first year might best be characterized as a modest success. Considering the effort expended as compared to individually taught courses, perhaps it should have been more successful. However one is encouraged by a careful reading of the student evaluations. They contain not only many positive comments, but a good many useful suggestions. The students are aware of the time and effort the faculty invested in these courses. A number of the weaknesses of the first year are readily correctable. Some of the program's benefits are longer term. Students coming out of the core courses should soon be contributing more to our war and peace related courses.

The first year has been a learning experience for all of us.

M. Lutzker
S. Cooper

APPENDIX
(11)

Some basic data

Student enrollment:

Introduction to War & Peace I - Fall '72

26 students came into the course

5 dropped out the first week (apparently they dropped from the college, one year later their records are no longer in the Division office.)

Of the remaining 21, grades were as follows:

Honors	4	
Pass	10	(4 equivalent to a B plus)
Incomplete	3	
Withdrawal	4	(poor work and/or personal problems)

Introduction to War & Peace II - Spring '73

22 students in the course

Grades:	Honors	4	
	Pass	13	(3 equivalent to a B plus)
	Incomplete	3	
	Withdrawal	2	

Continuity of enrollment:

Out of 14 who completed War & Peace I (and had not graduated) 6 took War & Peace II.

Cross section of majors (figures include both courses)

History	19	
Economics	6	
Psychology	4	
Sociology	3	
Women's Studies	2	
joint majors	4	(combinations of the above)
		plus one each from Politics, American Studies, Dramatic Arts, English, & Science, Letters & Society.
Total	43	

RICHMOND COLLEGE

Division of Social Sciences

50.310 An Introduction to the Study of War &
Peace I
4 hours, 4 credits

Dr. M. Lutzker
Fall 1972

Course Syllabus

Description

An examination of war, past and present, with particular attention to its impact upon society, institutions and human values. Topics to be considered include: the nature of warfare in the pre-industrial age; modern total war; World War I and the beginnings of global upheaval; revolution and the ideology of modern guerrilla warfare; counterinsurgency; the response to revolution in the mid-twentieth century.

A comparative approach will be utilized, drawing upon material developed by political scientists, economists, and others. The course is taught cooperatively by faculty who specialize in each of the topics to be considered.

Outline of Content

I. Warfare in the pre-industrial era

War in Greece's Golden Age; Wars and Medievals: The Church and the Theory of Just and Holy War; Warfare in a Feudal Society; Militarism in the Eighteenth Century.

- a. Aristophanes' Lysistrata (recording)
- b. St. Augustine, City of God (selections)
- c. Sidney Painter, French Chivalry
- d. Walter Dorn, "Eighteenth Century Militarism"
Professors Roberts & Stearns

The nature of diplomacy in the pre-World War I period
Professor Fetzer

II. World War I: Modern total war

The revolution in war and diplomacy; pattern of the war; role of the new technology; the concept of the home front; opposition to the war; impact of the war upon European society; the transformation of American life; war and the literary imagination; some ideological consequences; economic impact; World War I as a turning point in modern history.

- a. Documentary film "Over There, 1914-1918"
- b. Gordon Craig, "War and European Society"
- c. Jack J. Roth, editor, World War I: A Turning Point in Modern History
- d. Bertrand Russell, "War -- The Offspring of Fear"
- e. Erich Maria Remarque, All Quiet on the Western Front
- f. D. H. Lawrence, Kangaroo (selections)
- g. Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (selections)

- h. Simeon Leland, "Next Steps in Financing the War"
- i. Arthur Bowley, "Some Economic Consequences of the Great War"
- j. Jonathan Hughes, "War and After"
Professors Cooper, Lutzker, Warnecke,
Ebel, Hirschfeld, & P. Fischer.

III. Revolutions and revolutionary warfare

Some distinctions between wars and revolutions. The theory of revolutionary warfare. Guerrilla warfare. The economics of underdeveloped nations and its relationship to modern revolutionary warfare. Vietnam as a case study.

- a. Edward Mead Earle, "Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin: Soviet Concepts of War" (Selections)
- b. Mao Tse-tung, On Protracted War
- c. Robert L. Heilbrunner, "The Revolution of Rising Expectations"
Professors Fetzner, Cooper
P. Fischer, & Lutzker.

IV. Counterinsurgency: The response to revolution in the mid-twentieth century.

The United States' assumption of "Free World" leadership: concepts and origins. American views of the underdeveloped world. Guerrilla warfare and U.S. policy. Communism, nationalism, and economic development in the "Third World." Vietnam: A turning point?

- a. C. Vann Woodward, "The Age of Reinterpretation"
- b. Henry Luce, "The American Century" (selections)
- c. Harry S. Truman, "The Truman Doctrine"
- d. W. W. Rostow, "Guerrilla Warfare in Underdeveloped Areas"
- e. Peter Paret & John W. Shy, "Guerrilla Warfare and U.S. Military Policy: A Study"
- f. Dept. of Defense film: "The Third Challenge"
Professors Lutzker, & P. Fischer

V. Course evaluation (Fri. Jan. 5 - Monday's schedule)

Student Activities and Evaluation

This course represents both an opportunity and a challenge for the student. Many faculty members have volunteered their time to present material in their own special areas of study. In addition they plan to be present in class to discuss and debate the findings of their colleagues. The intent is an interdisciplinary approach and a dialogue involving different viewpoints. We want student to be participants in the dialogue. Therefore, you should be prepared to discuss the readings and, together with faculty, debate their implications.

No exams or formal research papers are contemplated at this time. Instead all students will keep a journal for the duration of the course. This journal should contain the following:

- Notes, summaries, & comments on the assigned readings
- Notes & comments on class lectures & discussions
- Questions that seem to you to require clarification
- Answers to some of the general questions the course proposes to examine
- Comments, thoughts, ideas that represent your own efforts to understand the nature of war.

Your journal should be typewritten if possible. If handwritten it must be easily readable. Entries should be dated. Journals will be collected two or three times during the semester.

Those students who miss an unreasonable number of classes, or whose journals are unsatisfactory, will be asked to prepare an additional assignment.

Syllabus

Richmond College
Spring, 1973
Cooper/Lutzker

To the student:

This is a new course which will bring together past and present ideas and events about the ways people have considered the possibilities and impossibilities of achieving peace.

Because problems connected to peace are personal, economic, social and political in nature, we will bring in a variety of faculty from different disciplines who have something to say about peace.

Very broadly, peace ideas and activities can be divided into two large categories. There is the notion or definition of peace which sees it as the absence of war between states, peoples or communities for any given period. This vision of peace usually is held by "official" or "established" groups or individuals (or those supporting them) and also implies that peace might dissolve into war, if the parties at peace find themselves in an "intolerable" situation. Thus, this vision of peace assumes that war or violent conflict is an inevitable fact of human life or, at least, that it is the "final" arbiter of conflict.

Generally, this view of peace is basic to alliances, the balance of power argument and the division of areas into "spheres of influence." Sometimes peace is kept by the balancing of nearly equal forces; other times, by the police patrol of a super or preponderant power. Thus, for instance, Napoleon -- while in exile -- wrote in his memoirs that he made war on Europe, tried to subdue all its monarchs (from 1804-14), in order that the peoples of Europe might live forever after in peace under his son. Students might find similar ideas among extreme advocates of the view that America should never be a second rate power.

A wholly different vision or definition of peace is that which sees all men, despite social and cultural differences, as participating in the human community, the brotherhood of a global village. From early Christianity to modern anti-Vietnam war peace activists, this vision has argued that peace is an attainable goal for man, IF certain basic changes were to occur. The supporters of this view range from absolute pacifists who will bear arms against no one, from deep-seated moral convictions, to a wide range of social and political reformers. Centuries ago, this view attracted the commitment of small religious sects, some of which argued that Christianity required the abolition of warfare. In more recent years, it has attracted the interest of people who believe that wars are the natural result of various economic and social injustices. No balance or power nor super power status can eliminate war because it does not touch on the truly basic issues -- why men fight?

These two views are far more complex than presented above. In our explorations of peace ideas, movements and organizations, as well as obstacles to peace, we will encounter variations on these themes.

Topics

Introduction to the course & participating faculty

I. TWO VISIONS OF PEACE

Henry Kissinger, Introduction to A World Restored
Daniel Berrigan, "A Meditation from Catonsville" and
Statement of the Catonsville Nine.

II. PEACE IDEAS IN CONFLICT FROM THE EARLY CHRISTIANS TO THE 18th CENTURY

- a. Pacifism and anti-militarism in early Christianity
Peter Brock, "Introduction, Anti-militarism in the Early Church"
in Pacifism in Europe to 1914, pp. 3-24.
Professor R. Chiles
- b. Medieval European Peace Thought and Erasmus: The
Infancy of Modern Ideas on Peace.
Professor P. Roberts
- c. Development of Peace Thought in Europe in the 16th-18th centuries.
Chronological Chart of Major Peace Plans by S. Cooper
E. Souleyman, "Rousseau" in Visions of Peace in 17th and
18th Century France.
Professor S. Cooper

III. THE BIRTH OF PEACE MOVEMENTS

- a. The Early Years of the American Peace Movement
Alice F. Tyler, "The Peace Crusade" in Freedom's Ferment.
Professors Lutzker & M. Greenberg
- b. European Peace Movements of the 19th and early 20th centuries.
Christina Phelps, Anglo-American Peace Movements in the
mid-19th Century.
Sandi Cooper, "European Peace Movements before World War I."
Professor S. Cooper

IV. PEACE MOVEMENTS DURING WAR AND PEACE:
A CASE STUDY OF WORLD WAR I

- a. The pre-1914 peace movement and its transformation in wartime.
Michael Lutzker, "The Pacifist as Militarist: A Critique
of the American Peace Movement, 1898-1914."
- b. Peace activists in wartime Britain and the U.S.
Blanche W. Cook, "Democracy in Wartime: Antimilitarism
in England and the U.S., 1914-1918," American Studies
(Spring, 1972), pp. 51-68.
Professors Lutzker & S. Cooper

V. THE USES OF PACIFIST TECHNIQUES: THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

- a. Gandhi and Indian Freedom.
Film: "Mahatma Gandhi"
Joan V. Bondurant, "Gandhi's Satyagraha against the
Rowlatt Bills" from The Conquest of Violence
Professor Swiderski
- b. Opposition to the war in Vietnam
Film: "But What Do We Do?"
Professors Cooper & Lutzker

VI. OBSTACLES TO PEACE: THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

- a. Cultural conditioning: children's attitudes toward war.
Film: "Toys on a Field of Blue"
- b. Education for patriotism -- the use and abuse of History
Questionnaire for grade school children
Professor H. Kavett
- c. The socialization process
Sanford M. Dornbusch, "The Military Academy as an
Assimilating Institution"
Professor M. Bernstein
- d. The Milgrim Studies on authority and violence: Their
implications for the peace movement.
Stanley Milgrim, "Some Conditions of Obedience and
Disobedience to Authority" Human Relations, (Feb. 1965)
S.L.A. Marshall, Men Against Fire (Excerpt)
Film: "Obedience"
Professor M. Bernstein
- e. The role of scientists in creating and controlling weaponry
H. L. Nieburg, In the Name of Science (selections)
Film: "Hiroshima-Nagasaki"
Professors S. Bernow & S. Cooper
- f. The role of the military in the U.S.
Gen. David Shoup (Ret.) "The New American Militarism"
Atlantic Monthly, (April, 1969)
Dept. of Defense, "The Economics of Defense Spending"
Commanders Digest, (Sept. 28, 1972) pp. 12-13; 22-24.
Film: "The Selling of the Pentagon"
Professors J. Fetzer & M. Lutzker
- g. Changing from a Cold War economy to a peacetime economy
Can it be done without crisis and depression?
Bert V.A. Roling, World Peace Through World Economy (Excerpt)
Professor P. Fischer
- h. Love and War in the Western literary tradition
William Shakespeare, Anthony and Cleopatra
Professor H. Ebel

VII. A LOOK INTO THE FUTURE

- a. Was the Vietnam War a turning point? New directions in great
power diplomacy. The future of U.S.-China-Russia relations.
Panel discussion: Professors O. Fedyshyn (Politics),
S. Stearns (History), R. Swiderski (Anthropology)

Course evaluation.

Course requirements.

Copies of readings will be distributed to the class in advance of the days they shall be discussed. Students who miss a class are responsible for picking up copies of any readings for the following class.

All students are required to keep a journal for the first one third of the semester. This is to record major ideas in the readings, along with your response to them; class discussion; and reflections on the central problems in the course.

Thereafter students may choose either to continue their journal or write two essays dealing with major questions.

First due date for journal: March 16.

Second due date for journal or essay: April 23.

Third due date for journal or essay: May 31.

Journals or essays that are considered unsatisfactory or incomplete will have to be re-written.

Richmond College
Spring 1973
Cooper/Lutzker

On Keeping a Journal

Compiling a journal is not an easy task. Almost all students who tried it last semester experienced considerable difficulty. It is unlike research papers, essays, and similar written assignments you are called upon to produce for other courses. But if it is undertaken with thought and care the result can be an interesting -- even a valuable -- document.

We share a common concern about the dangers of war in an age in which we can all be incinerated. We are anxious to achieve a peace that is something more than an interlude between wars. We would all like presumably, to spare our children the experience of war. Therefore, as we read and talk during the semester, we will singly and collectively be searching for some answers. Think of the journal as a written record of our search, and yours, during the next few months.

After reading the brief selections from Kissinger and Berrigan put on record at the outset some indication of your feeling about the overall question we will be considering. What kinds of changes will have to take place to bring about peace? Or you might like to speculate on what a world without war might be like -- for you, for others who have experienced war more directly. Could it be a challenging and exciting time in which to live? Or would it more likely be dull? Choose your own way to begin but the point is don't just go through the motions. Put your own thinking on the record as of now. Later in the semester you may find it interesting to go back and look at it.

For the first few weeks we will be discussing some extraordinary individuals -- ancient and modern -- who tried, by a variety of means, to find a way of sparing men the necessity of slaughtering their fellow beings. Set down in the journal what you think of them and their ideas. Were they wise? Foolish? Admirable? More important, is there something to be learned from their experience? Does it relate to your own feelings or experiences? Try to avoid snap judgments. Where possible put down your views in some detail.

In class we will try to elaborate upon some ideas in the readings. There should be no shortage of questions. Pose them in your journal...ask them in class. Participating faculty will present different approaches. Make some record of what is said in class. Sometimes what you hear there may not seem all that important at first. Later upon reflection (perhaps after some additional reading) it might have more significance. Anyhow take some class notes, if necessary as an 'act of faith' that they will prove useful later on. They should form part of your journal and hopefully will aid you when putting down some reflections of your own.

War & Peace journal cont'd.

When we discuss some of the obstacles to peace let us speak frankly about them. Are they the result of some innate depravity of men? Are they an outgrowth of social processes, social conditioning? Is it possible to overcome these obstacles? Your journal is the place to discuss these and other such questions.

Journals as Historical Documents

In centuries past journals were kept by a very minute proportion of the people. (How many could write? How many had the leisure? How many thought what they had to say was important?) As a result we have preserved for us almost exclusively the journals or diaries of generals & statesmen; princes & diplomats, theologians & philosophers, -- the elite. We have far fewer journals from slaves & serfs, artisans & factory workers, sharecroppers & housewives, peace activists & students.

Most of our picture of the past, our understanding of what people were like, comes from the words of the elite. It is very difficult to find out what others -- those who were not privileged -- believed. In our age of media (with its 30 second interview of the man on the street) the problem still exists.

If it helps you to write, think of your journal as an historical document. A record of what a thoughtful young person, born in the atomic age, who has experienced the Vietnam War, and the opposition to it -- feels and believes in 1973. While you can't be certain it will ever turn up in the hands of some distinguished historian a hundred years from now, it could certainly be read with interest by your grandchildren. But as you write bear one thing in mind. A good historian reading a journal tries to re-create the mind of the journal writer as he reads. He soon learns to distinguish between what the writer really believes, and the image - or myth he would like to create in the mind of the reader. In our era that has seen so much damage resulting from the "credibility gap" we should have a renewed appreciation of the truth.

Some Exerpts from Student Journals

1. At the beginning of the semester students read brief selections from Henry Kissinger and Daniel Berrigan in which each explained his approach to world peace. They were asked to discuss their own vision of peace, and what might be necessary to bring it about.

Spring '73

Peace is living with our fellow man without having to fight with him. It is accepting other people, cultures, lifestyles for what they are - without trying to change them to our way. It is responding to the actions of other men understandingly, reasonably and tolerantly without using force. If that's what peace is, and I'm not sure that it is, then living in a peaceful world would certainly be a challenge and even exciting. A challenge because its much more difficult to settle disputes peacefully than it is to settle them by force. It's easy for a nation to use force when it thinks disputes can be more easily or quickly settled. Take World War I or Viet Nam - where might was going to make right in a hurry, or so people thought. It takes a certain magnanimity for a nation to say no - they won't fight over an incident and I think that quality can be achieved by all nations. Russia certainly seems to have it; she decided the stakes were too high to fight over Cuba and she didn't pull big guns on us when Nixon had Haiphong Harbor mined. Russia displayed a reasonableness and magnanimity that the U.S. has only shown so far in peace settlements.

Mr. Kissinger says peace is a time between wars, "a period of stability" - he doesn't use the word peace too much. Obviously his kind of peace is what we have now. In Kissinger's practicality is also honesty. He realizes that his definition falls short of some expectations and says that, "... stability results from a generally accepted legitimacy which shouldn't be confused with justice." He defines diplomacy, a major factor in peace making and keeping, as "the adjustment of differences through negotiations" and as "the art of restraining the exercise of power."

Kissinger even goes so far as to say that too much peace can be hazardous as people lose the sense of the tragic. At first I thought he must be kidding, but after seeing a film on W.W.I, I knew he wasn't. It was amazing to see people eager to fight. Even Russia, a nation torn with dissent, rallied around the Tsar to fight the Germans. It was interesting to read a piece of work written by Kissinger himself. The press writes him up to be more of a superstar than a diplomat, a lover rather than a statesman. Underneath all his press is a thoroughly ordered, comprehensive and reasonable mind - to say the least.

Mr. Berrigan doesn't define peace. His main concern is with social injustice which he feels is the cause of wars. He would be opposed to Kissinger's kind of peace and want something higher, something better. Berrigan's burning of draft records was a civil offense but his protest can be seen as a part of the early christian tradition of non-violence and anti-militarism. Berrigan makes his own verbal war against the Selective Service, religious bureaucracy and a system of government he feels is oppressive, wasteful and burden with problems. Berrigan is a persuasive writer and much of what he writes makes sense. His burning of draft records was a last desperate effort to get people to see what America was doing. An effort he undertook after all legal and peaceful means failed.

He attacks his church with the same intensity he uses for the government. In this sense, he was right. The church could have taken a stand against the war, but didn't. With few exceptions the policy was to pray for peace not to actively oppose the war. The religious who did take a stand were treated like rebels in the church. However, I don't agree with Berrigan that the church is hostile to the poor. The church does much materially to alleviate some of the suffering of the poor. In the Catholic Church and I imagine most other religious institutions, there are numerous requests for donations to the poor; cash, food, clothing, time and services. Even more numerous are the religious mail solicitors, usually missionaries who run clinics, hospitals, schools and orphanages for the poor. I don't totally agree with Berrigan either on the question of "our country's crimes." However sullied and tarnished the image and promise of America seem, I think Berrigan and others who write about this nation's crimes are being one sided and unfair. If the U.S. is criminal for engaging in war, then those who fight against this country should also be considered perpetrators of crime, not victims of injustice by America. On the bombing of Hanoi I take exception to the point - there America alone was wrong, just as were the Germans in the blitz of England and the destruction of Europe in W.W. II. Maybe Berrigan writes this because he is concerned about America and expects more from his country.

Berrigan feels that something must be done to equalize the gap between the haves and the have nots here in America and throughout the world. He reasons that if the social and economic injustices that abound throughout the world can be eliminated, then there would be less reason for men to fight and peace could be a way of life instead of a time between wars. I'd like to believe that can be.

2. The following journal entry discusses Satyagraha, the non-violent approach developed in India under Gandhi's leadership. Students saw a brief film on Gandhi, and read an essay describing one of the campaigns. This was followed by class discussion.

Spring '73

Any discussion of the merits of Satyagraha must by its essence be divided into two distinct categories. On the one hand there are those social movements which do not attempt to alter drastically the fabric of a given society. Movements such as these are concerned with specific issues within an otherwise acceptable social structure. It is here that the Satyagraha when successfully initiated can become a viable means of gaining attention and generating discussion. Great care must be taken, however, in selecting the precise form that the Satyagraha will take. Violation of too sacred a tradition may result in a disastrous whiplash effect.

Also to be considered are those movements desirous of a revolutionary rethinking of the social, economic and political aspects of society. It is here that the Satyagraha becomes less than effective.

The Satyagraha, when successfully initiated becomes a great rallying force among like thinkers. It serves well in heaping attention upon the plight of its participants. And it generates a healthy discussion which is the life blood of constructive solutions. But it is also a snail-like procession. In support of this statement I need only point to the Gandhian drive for independence. The first nationwide Satyagraha took place for seven weeks in 1919. Indian independence was not realized until 1947. And, oddly enough, independence came at a time when the English presence was receding unilaterally.

The alternatives to Satyagraha within a revolutionary context are violence and bloodshed. And as such, decisions as to which road to follow take on grave moral overtones. One must carefully weigh the human costs of revolution relative to the prolongation of the status quo. Doing this requires a careful analysis of the specifics of one's own situation.

Aside from the human costs one must also consider the likelihood of success. When revolution seems doomed to failure the principles of Satyagraha become increasingly appealing. Likewise, if a Satyagraha proved inconsequential one may be driven to revolution. At any rate the decision to initiate Satyagraha is dictated by circumstance and by conscience. And I would here like to point to its inherent weakness.

The successful Satyagraha rests upon a foundation of non-violence. Crack this foundation and the movement will topple. Being so delicate an institution it becomes vulnerable from either of two sources. First to be considered is the reactions of the authorities. When the police respond in a forceful manner the threat is present of degenerating into a riot. Secondly, there is the threat of violence emanating from within. And this can take one of three directions.

Within any large crowd there are bound to be those dissidents hell bent upon destruction. They may be a disorganized rabble dispersed among the crowd at random. Or else, they may be an organized splinter group within the movement. Or they can even be police provocateurs.

In each and every case the results can spell disaster. Such factions whether by inflammatory orations or by overt acts of violence have it in their power to whip an otherwise peaceful crowd into a frenzy. And at the very least, their actions invite harsh police reprisals directed at the masses.

When considered in this light the Satyagraha becomes a risky business at best. A great deal of organizational ability is required as well as the political awareness of its participants. This does much to explain the high incidence of bloodshed in the Indian Satyagraha. American variations, however, have enjoyed a greater degree of success.

Consider, now, just those nations which are in dire need of a radical restructuring of social, economic and political institutions. It is those nations of the third world who are likely to perceive their situation thusly. And it is precisely those politically backward nations in which the Satyagraha is least likely to succeed. For them the Satyagraha is not a viable institution for effecting radical change within their societies. Where it is a viable institution, however, is in those nations whose citizens have attained a higher

degree of political awareness. Societies such as these are not, most often, (given the present world situation) ready to radically restructure society. They are more interested in questions of civil rights and domestic and foreign policy. Applied with discretion the Satyagraha may here be an effective means to the end. The process is long and arduous, however, requiring a great deal of patience and effort. There is no place in the Satyagraha for apathy and cynicism.

3. Some journal entries struck a more personal note.

December, 1972

I have just taken another look at the original question put forth to us at the beginning of the term...^{*} Originally I was optimistic & idealistic. I realize now that it is not as simple a picture as I had painted it. Only today President Nixon ordered an all out bombing in Vietnam because the 'Peace Talks' were not progressing as he wanted them to. Is this the way for a man of high morals & principles to act? A man who is running the country, and who is being judged by the rest of the world for his action cannot afford to make such blunders. When we are dealing with lives and kill so needlessly it is inhumane. I consider this a major world conflict, less nuclear warfare. Our fear of total destruction prevents us from using nuclear warfare. Diplomatic relations among the major countries will most certainly be strained. Once hard feelings occur how can anyone sit down and calmly discuss disagreements and iron out differences?

I say America is losing "face" towards the rest of the world. We have to realize that we must acknowledge and respect all forms of government, just as we want our freedom for democracy upheld. If our form of government is so great and righteous, why should we have any cause to fear other forms of governing in other countries?

With sadness, I have to change my outlook on the present world situation to one of pessimism.

^{*}"What are the chances of mankind averting a major war in your lifetime? Are you optimistic or pessimistic about the possibilities of achieving world peace?"